

MINUTES
**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE MEETING**

January 25, 2017 at 1:00 p.m.
Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Room
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan

Members Present:

Bill McEntee, CRA - **Chair**
Jonathan Start, MTPA/KATS
David Wresinski, MDOT–**Vice-Chair**

Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS
Jennifer Tubbs, MTA

Support Staff Present:

Roger Belknap, MDOT
Tim Colling, MTU, via Telephone
Hugh McNichol, MDOT
Bill Tansil, MDOT

Gil Chesbro, MDOT
Dave Jennett, DTMB/CSS
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Members Absent:

Bob Slattery, MML

Others Present:

Rob Balmer, MDOT

1. Welcome - Call-To-Order – Introductions:

The meeting was called-to-order at 1:04 p.m.

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

3. Correspondence and Announcements – R. Belknap

**3.1. - Transportation Asset Management Council (TAMC) Spring Conference,
May 25, 2017, Mount Pleasant, Michigan**

The preparation for the conference is moving along nicely. The conference will be held May 25, 2017 at the Comfort Inn and Suites Hotel and Conference Center in Mount Pleasant, Michigan. The Save-the-Date has been shared and the Conference Planning Committee is completing the agenda. They still need a couple more presenters for the conference.

3.2. - 21st Century Infrastructure Commission Report – TAMC Response Letter

A copy of the January 17, 2017 letter was shared. A response to the letter has not been received as of yet since the letter was recently sent.

4. Consent Agenda:

4.1. - Approval of the December 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes (Action Item)

J. Start made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of December 14, 2016;
D. Wresinski seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

5. Work Program:

5.1. - FY 2017-2019 TAMC Data Committee Work Program

Support staff is working on redesigning the work program.

5.1.1. – Regional and Metropolitan Planning Agency Unified Work Programs (UWP) – R. Belknap

This is still in progress and will be setting up more meetings.

5.1.2. – Asset Management Plan Template

The updated Basic Transportation Asset Management Plan template was reviewed. Most of the information from most agencies will be from the federal aid system since that is what we are currently funding. There is no problem if they include other data (non-federal aid, etc.) even though we do not reimburse them for it. This will be discussed at the next full TAMC meeting in a couple of weeks.

5.1.3. – 2016 TAMC Annual Report

H. McNichol has begun updating the report.

5.2. - Budget Update for FY2016 and FY2017

The budget update was not provided at this meeting due to the lack of time.

6. Review and Discussion Items:

6.1. - 2016 PASER Data and QA/QC Protocols – R. Belknap/D. Jennett/B. McEntee

In reviewing the 2016 PASER Data, G. Chesbro discovered a number of discrepancies in lane data for roads in Kent County. Most of the discrepancies were in the portion of the county managed by Grand Valley Metro Council (GVMC). D. Jennett reported that the TAMC database shows there was a change in lane miles in 2009. There was some speculation that this discrepancy may have been introduced by a corrupted file in the past, and the error then replicated itself every year since then. R. Belknap had a talk with Kent County and spoke with T. Colling and wanted to make sure they are trained properly. If county and state staff are in the truck they must play a role in QA/QC. This will be included in the training for regional coordinators. T. Colling and R. Belknap will discuss this with the regional coordinators. What lanes are and when do you split? T. Colling is not sure if this has been defined for the regions. G. Chesbro believes we have defined them in the past and will check on this and follow up with T. Colling. J. Start would like to know how we are handling other lanes other than through lanes? For instance, a five lane road with a left

turn lane. This definitely costs more to do a five lane road. The framework map has the number of lanes. CSS gets the number of lanes from the Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) data. In addition to correcting the problems we are currently having with GVMC, the actions outline above will hopefully either prevent this issue from occurring elsewhere in the state in the future or allow us to catch it and correct it sooner if it does reoccur. An update on this issue will be given at the next TAMC Full Council meeting.

It was also suggested that we need a collection of lane mile information placed in one place. A complete listing of all the lane miles in the state categorized by rural, local, etc. does not appear to exist, or at least not in a publicly accessible location. It was suggested that a pdf appendix listing of the agencies with this information at the end of the annual report can possibly be added this year. This would identify the many miles of road, surface type, whether it is on the federal aid system, number of bridges, etc. for each region. It would be nice to have all of this data in one place. Support staff can work on this after they finish with Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) re-write. A disclaimer will need to be placed on the bottom stating the data may not be exact. This could be a part of Quality Control (QC).

A draft of the new IRT page was displayed. The Website Subcommittee met this morning and fine-tuned this page. The Asset Management Certification Status page within the IRT was also shared and reviewed. This is the place where agencies can upload their written plan (if they hit the “yes” button and have a written plan) and/or answer questions on asset management plans or their process (if they hit the “no” button they do not have a written plan). At this time, TAMC does not have a requirement for agencies to have an asset management plan. There was a concern that the agency may not wish to upload their asset management plan because they fear being scrutinized. All of this is building up to requiring the agencies to submit an asset management plan. This will not stop the agency from completing their IRT requirement but there will be a minor problem. Who is going to contact the agencies if they do not have an asset management plan? We should not require them to update their plan every year. None of this is finalized. The subcommittee is asking Data Committee and ACE Committee what their input is. One suggestion was simply asking the agency if they have an asset management plan and when it was approved and they simply answer yes or no, give the date of approval and go on with their IRT requirement entry. But place a statement stating that in 2018 an asset management plan will be required (only from the top 125 agencies). The minimal is three years on an asset management plan and maximum will be 5 years. There was also a suggestion that the only the top 125 agencies have a different entry screen for their asset management plan. Another suggestion was that we need to indicate somewhere on the page that there are resources through the Regional Planning Organizations/Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (RPO’s/MPO’s) to assist them. We could also give a template or sample of an acceptable asset management plan. It is agreed from the committee that all agencies must answer the questions in the IRT

but not necessarily have to upload their asset management plan. Then at least we have their information.

D. Wresinski suggested that possibly the compliance discussion can be done with the RPO's and MPO's and not with TAMC in the IRT. Perhaps through the RPO/MPO Work Program the asset management plan information can also be discussed.

6.1.1. - 2016 Preliminary PASER Data Analysis Review PowerPoint Presentation (A copy of the presentation was shared.) - G. Chesbro

Lansing is not collected this year as it is collected on the odd year. G. Chesbro went over each slide of his PowerPoint. There were many issues with Kent County (Grand Valley Metro Council) that will need to be addressed (See discussion for item 6.1, above). The Quality Control subsets were a bit of a concern because they were off by a larger margin than in past years, although still within acceptable ranges. - New staff were being trained to do the quality control checks this year, and that may have contributed to the greater deviation from past years. G. Chesbro will do further analysis of this to figure out why this occurred. At the next Council meeting G. Chesbro will present the analysis for 2016. He will double check his comparisons to last year's results.

6.1.2. - Inventory Based Rating System Presentation – T. Colling

T. Colling has been presenting his Inventory Based Rating System PowerPoint presentation at different conferences where it has been well received. A copy of the presentation was shared with the committee.

6.2. - Non-Federal Aid Data Collection Policy – R. Belknap

6.2.1. – Data Collection Requests

R. Belknap spoke with a consultant who is working with a township and collecting PASER data for them and R. Belknap informed them that the data must be submitted by an ACT 51 agency (NOTE: Townships are not ACT 51 Agencies). J. Tubbs will contact Shelby Township and discuss this further with them.

6.3. - ADARS and IRT – R. Belknap/B. McEntee

6.3.1. – Warrantees Reporting in IRT – B. McEntee

The committee agreed to include the opportunity for agencies to identify if the project that they enter into the data base is a warranty project. A provision is that TAMC may not go live with this question until they release the IRT. Under current state law, if an agency plans to do a project that has a price tag of \$1,000,000 and above, it is required to obtain a warranty. TAMC would like to be informed about warranty projects, but we do not want to be responsible for ensuring that all warranty information has been collected, and that all the proper warranty procedures have been followed. TAMC will only use this information to see if

warranty projects perform better than non-warranty projects. TAMC will not be keeping track of the actual warranties.

6.3.2. – Compliance Status Report - D. Jennett/R. Belknap

The status report was shared and 333 agencies are now compliant. R. Belknap and D. Jennett will check to see if the top 125 are in compliance. It was also requested that the top 125 be identified with an asterisk on the report.

The IRT data will be used in the TAMC Annual Report. This is the first year that TAMC will have enough data from the IRT to place in the report.

CSS would like to know if they should use calendar year or fiscal year. Keeping in mind that agencies have different fiscal years and could have two construction periods entered. CSS will look at the data and see what works best. D. Jennett will update the document and provide a copy by e-mail to everyone to review.

6.3.3. – IRT Rewrite – D. Jennett

See above.

6.4. - Website Update – D. Jennett

CSS has updated the TAMC Website with the upcoming May 25, 2017 TAMC Spring Conference information.

6.5. - Dashboard Update – D. Jennett

Nothing new to report.

7. Member Comments:

None

8. Public Comments:

None

9. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m. The next meeting will be held February 25, 2017, at 1:00 p.m., MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room, Lansing.